2022891313

T-995 P.001 F-820

750 17th Street NW Suite 900 Washington, D.C. 20006 (202) 289-1313

Telecopier (Fax) Number: (202) 289-1330

1/8/24

ARNES & THORNBURG

ttorneys at Law

FAX COVER SHEET

JUN 0 4 2004

Examiner Patel

COMPANY NAME:

USPTO

Art Unit: 3624

TELECOPY NO.:

703-746-5563

FROM: DATE:

Perry Palan June 4, 2004

TIME SENDING:

NUMBER OF PAGES (INCLUDING THIS COVER SHEET): 12

If you have difficulty receiving this Fax, please call Barnes & Thomburg at (202) 408-6939 and ask for La Verne Jenkins.

Re:

Applicant:

Adcock et al.

Serial No.:

09/254,148

Filed:

June 11, 1999

For:

AUTOMATIC ELECTRONIC FUNDS TRANSFER

SYSTEM AND METHOD

Atty. Docket: 663/35631

Enclosed is an Amendment to be filed in the above-referenced case.

CLIENT # MATTER#

663 35631

Original to follow by mail Original will not follow by mail

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This message is for the exclusive use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and is confidential. If you are not the addressee or an employee or agent of the addressee responsible for delivering it to the addressee, please do not read, use, disclose, copy or distribute this message and do not take any action in reliance upon it. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by telephone (collect) to arrange for its return. We do not intend to waive any attorney-client or work product privilege by the transmission of this message.

Indianapolis

Fort Wayne

South Bend

Elkhart

Chicago

Washington, D.C.

Attorney Docket No. 663/35631 PATENT



1/2/2

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant(s):

Adcock et al.

JUN 0 4 2004

Serial No.:

09/254,148

Art Unit:

3624

Filed:

June 11, 1999

Examiner:

Patel

For:

AUTOMATIC ELECTRONIC FUNDS TRANSFER SYSTEM AND

METHOD

AMENDMENT

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to a telephone interview on June 2, 2004, please amend the abovereferenced application as follows:

IN THE CLAIMS

Applicant has amended Claims 1, 3, 4, 21, 35, 36, 38, 39, 57 and 58, as shown in the Claim Summary Document attached hereto.

REMARKS

As indicated by the Examiner, the claims may be unclear as to the difference between the user terminal and a user terminal associated with the user card. To remove any misinterpretation, some of the claims have been amended. As described in the specification on page 13 and in Claims 21-26, the user card may have a processor and thus perform most of the claims functions of and/or constitute the user terminal.

An earnest attempt has been made to respond to the Examiner's rejections to place the application in condition for allowance. Upon review of the arguments, it will be evident that Claims 1-58 are allowable over the art of record. Thus, passage of this case to issue is respectfully solicited.